



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,121	01/26/2001	Stefan Johansson	15292.5	7000
22913	7590	09/14/2005	EXAMINER	
WORKMAN NYDEGGER (F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY) 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			MOORE, IAN N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2661	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/771,121	Applicant(s) JOHANSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Ian N. Moore	Art Unit 2661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-21 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/20/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-16, 18-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturniolo et al (US 6,154,461) in view of Eng et al (US 5,958,018) and Honkasalo (US006094426A).

With regard to claims 1 and 13, Sturniolo et al discloses an operating protocol for a mobile terminal roaming between LANs as illustrated by FIG 1. Sturniolo et al discloses that the mobile terminal 36 (wireless communication station) registers with an access point AP1 (column 6, lines 65-67). Sturniolo et al further discloses that the mobile terminal 36 establishes a session for communication with GATEWAY 1 to communicate (receiving/transmitting) with other devices (originator) in the communication system 20 (column 7, lines 40-43). As illustrated by FIG 3, data packets include a source address (network address) that identifies (identity) the originator (column 10, lines 23-25).

Sturniolo et al, however, does not expressly disclose a verification step based upon the identity of the originator. Eng et al discloses a check as to whether an origination MAC address is registered upon receiving a MAC frame as illustrated by FIG 15 (column 4, lines 59-66). The group of MAC addresses that are registered form a set (predetermined originators).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Eng et al in Sturniolo et al to identify a subset of mobile terminals such as those that are being served by an associated access processor (Eng, column 4, lines 29-32). At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine the check as to whether an origination MAC address is registered as disclosed by Eng et al with communication system disclosed by Sturniolo et al (collectively "Sturniolo-Eng") to obtain the invention specified in claims 1 and 13.

Neither Sturniolo nor Eng explicitly discloses "mobile". However, mobile communication station performing the method of receiving, verifying and establishing is well known in the art. In particular, Honkasalo teaches receiving at the wireless mobile station communication station (see FIG. 2, MS10 receives broadcast/paging message from BS 20; see col. 4, line 25-52; see col. 5, line 45-52), verifying at the wireless mobile station (see col. 5, line 26-49; see col. 7, line 27-40; see col. 10, line 10-20; mobile station evaluates/verifies the message), establishing at the wireless communication station (see col. 7, line 1-5; see col. 8, line 25-30; performing the call-set up). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide receiving, verifying and establishing means in the mobile station, as taught by Honkasalo, in the combined system of Sturniolo and Eng, so that it would provide an efficient method for transmitting packet data over a network; see Honkasalo col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 16.

With regard to claims 2 and 14, Sturniolo et al discloses that the mobile terminal 36 establishes a session for communication with GATEWAY 1 (network server) to communicate (receiving/transmitting) with other devices (originator) in the communication system 20 (column

Art Unit: 2661

7, lines 40-43). Eng et al discloses a check as to whether an origination MAC address (name of a network server) is registered upon receiving a MAC frame as illustrated by FIG 15 (column 4, lines 59-66). The group of MAC addresses that are registered form a set.

With regard to claims 3, 4, 8, 15, 16 and 20, Eng et al discloses a check as to whether an origination MAC address (originator) is registered (determining / comparing) upon receiving a MAC frame as illustrated by FIG 15 (column 4, lines 59-66). Address translation tables (address translation) such as that disclosed by Eng et al (column 4, lines 61-66) are well known in the art. Whether a check as to whether an address is registered occurs before or after address translation, an address is ultimately verified. Sturniolo et al discloses that the mobile terminal 36 establishes a session for communication with GATEWAY 1 (network server) to communicate (packet data session) with other devices (originator) in the communication system 20 (column 7, lines 40-43).

With regard to claims 6 and 18, Eng et al discloses a check as to whether an origination MAC address (originator / network address) is registered upon receiving a MAC frame as illustrated by FIG 15 (column 4, lines 59-66). Sturniolo et al discloses that the mobile terminal 36 establishes a session for communication with GATEWAY 1 to communicate (packet data session) with other devices (originator) in the communication system 20 (column 7, lines 40-43).

With regard to claims 7 and 19, data packets include a source address (IP address) as illustrated by FIG 3 (Sturniolo column 3, lines 23-25).

With regard to claims 9 and 21, network servers are typically identified by an Internet host domain name.

With regard to claim 23, the combined system of Sturniolo-Eng-Honkasalo discloses all limitations as set forth in rejection of claim 13 above. Moreover, Eng further discloses a check as to whether an origination MAC address (originator) is registered (predetermined) upon receiving a MAC frame as illustrated by FIG 15 (column 4, lines 59-66). Sturniolo et al discloses that the mobile terminal 36 establishes a session for communication with GATEWAY 1 to communicate (packet data session) with other devices in the communication system 20 (wireless communication network) (column 7, lines 40-43).

3. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturniolo in view of Eng and Haddock, in further view of Koyama (US Patent 5,654,957).

Sturniolo-Eng-Honkasalo does not expressly disclose describe the makeup of the mobile station.

With regard to claim 11, Koyama et al discloses the packet communication unit also includes a processor 31 (computer executable/microprocessor) in which a memory (computer-readable medium) is inherent (Koyama column 5, lines 39-45).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the packet communication unit disclosed by Koyama in the mobile terminal disclosed by Sturniolo-Eng-Honkasalo to provide a display in the mobile station (Eng column 5, lines 21-27). At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Koyama with Sturniolo-Eng-Honkasalo to obtain the invention in claim 11.

With regard to claim 12, Koyama et al further discloses that the packet communication unit also includes a processor 31 (processing means) in which a memory (memory means) inherent (Koyama column 5, lines 39-45). Koyama also disclose a keyboard (interface circuitry) for inputting information required for operation (Koyama column 5, lines 21-27).

4. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturniolo in view of Eng and Haddock, in further view of Lahtinen (US Patent 5,351,235).

Sturniolo-Eng-Honkasalo does not expressly disclose a received network address is received in a short message.

With regard to claims 5 and 17, Lahtinen discloses a GSM short message service (short message service) in which mobile phone that receives the message (short message) containing the address (network address) of the transmitting terminal equipment (see col. 8, line 2-8).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Sturniolo-Eng-Honkasalo and Lahtinen to transmit the message to all mobile phones in the areas or broadcast service (see Lahtinen col. 1, line 64-68). At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 17.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 10 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-21, and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian N. Moore whose telephone number is 571-272-3085. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM- 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2661

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

INM
9/6/05



CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600